



TITLE:

欧文要旨

AUTHOR(S):

CITATION:

欧文要旨. 西洋古典論集 2008, 21: 53-55

ISSUE DATE:

2008-03

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/66181>

RIGHT:

SUMMARIES

Erläuterungen zum 17. Gedicht des Bakchylides

Tatsuya Abe

Bakchylides erzählt den Mythos des Theseus im 17. Gedicht, in dem Aphrodites Liebe wichtiges Thema ist. Am Anfang des Gedichts erscheinen die heiligen Gaben der Kypris (V.10), und am Ende leuchten die Gaben der Götter um die Glieder des Theseus (V.123f.). Als er zu Poseidons Palast kommt, ist der Gott abwesend, aber empfängt ihn seine Frau Amphitrite. Sie hängt ihm einen purpurnen Mantel um, und setzte ihm einen goldenen Kranz mit Rosen auf, die Aphrodite ihr auf ihrer Hochzeit schenkte. In der zweiten Hälfte dieses Gedichtes werden die stillen und phantastischen Umstände unter dem Meer geschildert, und besonders schön ist das Zusammentreffen des Theseus mit Amphitrite.

Als der Held von der See zurückkehrt, jubeln die sieben Mädchen auf dem Schiff. ἀγλαόθρονοι...κοῦραι (V.124f.) bedeuten nicht die Nereiden, sondern die athenischen Mädchen. Das Erklingen der See (V.127) entspringt der von Poseidon gemachten Dünung, und beweist, dass der Meeresherr wahrer Vater des Theseus ist.

Roman Politicians and the Acceptance of Divination in State Politics — A Debate on the Existence of the Gods in Cicero's *De divinatione* —

Tokiko Takahata

In his book *De divinatione*, while Cicero adopts a stance that denies the existence of *divinitas* (divinity) in divination, Quintus adopts one that acknowledges it. In many of Cicero's dialogues, one Epicurean interlocutor represents Cicero's stance (i.e., denial of the existence of divinity). For example, in *De natura deorum*, Velleius, who represents Epicurean thought,

adopts a stance that denies the divinity of nature and existence of gods (he is criticized by Cotta, according to whom Velleius' affirmation is merely a facade; it is not something he genuinely believes in). It is also significant that while Cicero denies the existence of *divinitas* in divination, he acknowledges it in *De legibus*.

Does Cicero really deny the existence of divination based on divinity or providence in *De divinatione*? It is interesting to consider the intentions behind his vehement denial of divination in *De divinatione*, which is the focus of this paper.

This paper assumes that Cicero does not genuinely deny the existence of divinity, but deliberately plays the role of doing so in order to emphasize the point that it is egoistic on the part of modern politicians to exploit religious ceremonies, which are performed independent of the will of the gods. Although this is not conveyed directly by Cicero, it can be deduced through his arguments with Quintus in *De divinatione*.

The Outbreak of 'Civil War' in *Aeneid* 7:

The Function of Allecto

Kenji Kamimura

The aim of this paper is to explore the function of Allecto in the outbreak of war in the seventh book of the *Aeneid* from a new perspective.

The War in the second half of the *Aeneid* can be considered as a kind of civil war (cf. 7.545 *discordia*), because the Trojans and the Italians unite into one in the future (6.756-62, 12.834-8), and several features of Civil War enumerated in the *Georgics*, especially in the epilogue of the Book 1, are discernible in the seventh book of the *Aeneid* (e.g. *Geo.*1.506-8~*Aen.*7.635-6).

The War in Italy is caused by Allecto on the order of Juno. Although Allecto is one of the Furies, even her sisters hate her (7.327-8), because she

has more evil inclinations: she loves civil war (325 *tristia bella*, cf. 545) and treachery (326 *insidiae*, 338 *artes*). Some of Juno's words about Allecto (335-6, 338-9) are reminiscent of the *Georgics*.

The instigation of Allecto is described in three stages, and in each of them she uses not only terror, but also deceit (cf. 552 *terrorum et fraudis*). First, she maddens Amata with a snake, which indicates deceit (350 *fallit*) as well as horror (348 *monstro*). And Amata pretends to be a Bacchante (385) under the influence of Allecto (405). Secondly, Allecto incites Turnus to war in the disguise of an old priestess (415ff.). After he mocks her, she reveals herself and drives a torch into his chest, causing terror (458-9). Thirdly, Allecto arouses the countrymen of Latium with a new trick (477 *arte nova*). She directs an arrow of Ascanius to the pet deer (498-9), and sounds the shepherds' alarm, arousing fear (511-20). In this way the Italians lose control of themselves (377 *sine more*, cf. 466 *nec iam se capit*).

Allecto thus succeeds in causing civil war (545), and reports to Juno. Allecto's ironic remark (546) indicates the irreversibility of the situation: even Juno cannot restore peace. Juno forbids any further intervention, saying 'Enough of terror and deceit' (552), which suggests that the Italians are sufficiently (406 *satis*) goaded.

Allecto's influence continues even after her departure. The Italians put pressure on the king Latinus to declare war against the Trojans (573ff.). At first he resists, but soon relinquishes control of the situation (600). This scene recalls the simile of a chariot at the end of the first book of the *Georgics* (511-4), which underscores the uncontrollability of the Civil War (511 *Mars impius*). Like the charioteer in the simile, Latinus loses control of affairs (*Geo*.1.514 *fertur, habenas* ~ *Aen*.7.594 *ferimur*, 600 *habeas*).

Virgil thus depicts the outbreak of 'Civil War' and emphasizes its uncontrollability by recalling the epilogue of the first book of the *Georgics*. The function of Allecto is to agitate the Italians by means of terror and deceit until they become out of control.